



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	1	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/738,455	3,455 12/13/2000		Jackie Zhanhong Wu	PRPL3012	9743	
23488	7590	07/28/2005		EXAM	EXAMINER	
GERALD I		NBERG	SCHUBERT	SCHUBERT, KEVIN R		
285 HAMIL		E	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
SUITE 520			2137			
PALO ALT	O, CA 9	94301	DATE MAILED: 07/28/2005			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

" 	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
/	09/738,455	WU ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Kevin Schubert	2137				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR.1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 Ju 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This 3) Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, p	•				
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) 8 and 12 is/are pending in the applica 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 8 and 12 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on 11 July 2005 is/are: a) Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	☑ accepted or b) ☐ objected to drawing(s) be held in abeyance. So ion is required if the drawing(s) is o	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a). bjected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 11082004.	4) Interview Summar Paper No(s)/Mail I 5) Notice of Informal 6) Other:					

5

10

15

20

25

30

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 8 and 12 have been considered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The phrase "wherein said server system establishes a user account identification on said client system" is indefinite. It is unclear whether the establishment is actually done on the client system or whether the server system simply makes an establishment (recognizes a user account) from a user account identification residing on a client system. The examiner believes the latter to be the case. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 8 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Markus, U.S. Patent No. 6,490,601.

As per claim 8, the applicant describes a server system, operable in connection with a central repository of confidential user data, to support the selective distribution of confidential user-information to

Application/Control Number: 09/738,455

Art Unit: 2137

5

10

15

20

25

authorized partner sites on behalf of users of client computer systems, which have specific confidential user data requirements comprising the following limitations which are met by Markus:

Page 3

- a) a connection to a database storing confidential user data within a user account and wherein datums of confidential user data are selectable based on an account identification and server datum identifications (Col 5, lines 29-44);
- b) a computer system, coupleable to a communications network and, through said connection, to said database, said computer system being responsive to a network request received from a partner site relative to a client computer system, wherein said network request provides said account identification and said server datum identifications, wherein said server datum identifications have a mapped relationship to the confidential user-information requirements of said partner site with respect to said user account, which is expressed as partner datum identifications, and wherein said computer system supports the determination of said mapped relationship for said partner site and provides for the generation and distribution of a mapped relationship definition to said partner site packaged to be sent as part of said network request in response to a single click on said partner site, wherein said mapped relationship definition implements said mapped relationship in a form evaluateable by said server system upon receipt as part of said network request, to enable said server system to provide a network response to said partner site containing datums of confidential user-information corresponding to said partner datum identifications, wherein said partner datum identifications and corresponding datums of confidential user-information are exclusive of executable code required to be executed by said client computer system (Col 7, line 41 to Col 8, line 5, Col 3, line 38 to Col 4, line 8);
- c) a mapping processor, coupled to receive said mapped relationship definition, that implements combinatorial and logical functions to autonomously convert server datums to partner datums through a process defined by said mapped relationship definition (Col 15, lines 20-53);

Markus discloses a system which meets all the limitations of the above claim except for the limitation "wherein said partner datum identifications and corresponding datums of confidential user-information are exclusive of executable code required to be executed by said client computer system". In Markus' system, the response set of first user information includes user information and shippable code

Art Unit: 2137

5

10

15

20

(Col 11, lines 2-14). The shippable code is transported with the user information and used to complete form fields associated with the user information. Thus, Markus' does not disclose sending the datums of confidential user-information exclusive of executable code because Markus' system sends the confidential user-information with executable code as part of a package.

However, Markus does disclose in the Background of the Invention section that a method known as the "transactor method" is similar to Markus' instant invention and relies on only sending user information **not** executable code. As disclosed by Markus, "Another method for assisting a user in filling out an electronic form document is referred to as the "transactor" method... This method differs from the wallet method in that the user is not required to download or install any software onto his or her computer" (Col 3, lines 38-44). Instead of receiving user information and executable code as taught by Markus in his system, the user receives only user information. Fig 2 is an illustration of the "transactor" method in which user information (241 of Fig 2) is received instead of user information and shippable code (324 of Fig 3A) as is the case in Markus' system.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was filed to combine the ideas of the prior art "transactor" method in Markus' system because sending only the user information reduces needed bandwidth for communication between the repository and the user. For example, this system would be optimal in situations where bandwidth is limited or expensive.

As per claim 12, the applicant describes the server system of claim 8, which is met by Markus, with the following limitation which is also met by Markus:

Wherein said computer system is coupleable through said communications network to said client system operated by a user, wherein said server system establishes a user account identification on said client system, and wherein said client system autonomously provides said user account identification to said server system in connection with said network request (Col 11, lines 39-49).

Art Unit: 2137

5

10

15

20

25

The new drawings have been received and are accepted by the examiner. The objection to the drawings has been withdrawn.

Applicant's arguments, see Remarks, filed 7/11/05, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 8 and 12 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made.

Conclusion

This action is made non-final.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kevin Schubert whose telephone number is (571) 272-4239. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Emmanuel Moise can be reached on (571) 272-3868. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

IMARY EXAMINER Art Unit 2/37

KS